

IBS

VOLUME 11

APRIL

1989



Property of
Graduate Theological Union

JUN 5 1989

IRISH BIBLICAL STUDIES

Editor: Rev Professor E.A. Russell
Union Theological College
Belfast BT7 1JT

Associate Editors: Professor Ernest Best
13 Newmills Gdns
St Andrews KY16 8RY

Rev Professor J.C. McCullough
Union Theological College
Belfast BT7 1JT

Editorial Advisory Panel:

Rev Dr. David Hill, The University, Sheffield S10 2TN
Dr J.G. McConville, Trinity College, Stoke Hill, Bristol
Principal R.J. McKelvey, Northern College, Luther King
House, Brighton Grove, Rusholme, Manchester.
Rev. Professor J.S. McIvor, Union Theological College
Rev Martin O'Callaghan, Trench House, St Mary's College,
Belfast BT 11
Rev J.S. McPolin, S.J., Milltown Park, Dublin 6
Professor E. Nicholson, Oriel College Oxford
Rev Vincent Parkin, Edgehill College, Belfast BT9 5BY
Mr David Payne, 2 Westfield Ave., Watford, Herts
Professor Jacob Weingreen, Trinity College, Dublin 2

Subscriptions

Individuals £6.50 Sterling or 7.50 Irish Pounds
Institutions £10.00 sterling or 18 US dollars

All subscriptions should be made payable to "Irish
Biblical Studies" and addressed to the Editor.

Copyright © IBS 1989

Errata: IBS 11, January, 1989

P44 lines 1-6 from top should follow p41

p27 should be p25; p28 should be p26;

p25 should be p27; p26 should be p28

The following should be inserted after the word "limbs" (line 7 p26)

The evil man is torn from his imagined security and "they" march him before the King of Terrors. "They" refers to the power of the underworld, Death the Hunter and his attendants who have trapped the wicked and the First-born of Death who has smitten him with a consuming disease.

Again a Mesopotamian background to this figure seems likely. Nergal, lord of the kingdom of the Dead, was a figure who inspired terror. In a seventh B.C.E. tablet from Asshur, an Assyrian prince desires and is granted a vision of the underworld. In his dream he is taken before the dread Nergal himself. The text indicates that the underworld was filled with terror before Nergal. He shrieked at the prince with tempestuous anger and brandished a fearsome scepter. /9

Death the Shepherd

This personification of Death only occurs once in the Old Testament in Psalm 49.15a. The Psalm is a wisdom poem which attempts to resolve the recurring paradox of faith that the arrogant wealthy flourish while the oppressed righteous man drowns in misfortune. In the end, the paradox is resolved by death which comes to rich and poor alike. God, according to the poem, will ransom the poor from death and the underworld. If this is only a temporary reprieve from death, it seems at best an unsatisfactory solution to the paradox, the masal.

Death herds them like sheep, their destination is Sheol.

The Editor regrets any inconvenience caused.

Contents

- Warren C. Carter, The Contingency of Romans 3.21-26
54-68
- J.M. Ross, Does 1 Corinthians hold water?
69-72
- E.A. Russell, The Growth of Christianity over the first
Five Centuries in the Light of Jewish Faith.
73-93
- Reviews
- Alice L. Laffey, An Introd. to the OT; A feminist
Perspective (D.R.G.Beattie); John Barclay, Obeying the
Truth, A Study of Paul's Ethics in Galatians (E.A.
Russell); Peter Pokorny. The Genesis of Christology
(J.C. McCullough); John Barton, People of the Book
(Sub-title: The Authority of the Bible in Christianity)
(J. McCormack)
94-104

Rome (and Jerusalem): The Contingency of Romans

3:21-26

Warren C. Carter

Exegetes of this oft-discussed passage have employed a range of methods. One approach has been to note the key phrase dikaïosunē theou (v21,22,25) and discuss the passage as explicating that concept. /1 Another method begins with the literary context of Romans 3 and delineates the new material introduced at 3.21ff. /2 A third discussion has focussed on 3.24-26 and sought to determine whether Paul cites traditional material and what "this tradition means for him and for his theology of justification" (my emphases). /3 A fourth approach is that of most commentaries where, after the mandatory introduction to the letter, the content of 3:21-26 is discussed in its literary context and in relation to the rest of Paul's thought.

Methodologically, these approaches have concentrated on the "coherence" of the passage, but what is lacking is an attempt to struggle explicitly with the "contingency" of 3:21-26. /4 Why did Paul write this particular passage to the Roman church - pasin tois ousin en Rômē (1.7)? What dimensions of the Roman situation does 3:21-26 specifically address?

This article will address the contingency of 3:21-26. We will briefly survey some recent discussions of the purpose of Romans and will note that, although the Roman situation is difficult to determine, tensions between Jewish and Gentile Christians at Rome (and at Jerusalem) provide the most likely setting. Then we will consider 3:21-26 in relation to such a situation. Our contention will be that Paul seeks to resolve the tensions of Jewish and Gentile Christians by stressing three themes. Important for Paul's argument is the assertion that the saving act of God in Christ not only determines relation with God, but also radically transforms social relationships. /5 Limits of space will prevent a full discussion of the passage and the letter; our focus will be restricted to making explicit the link of the content

of 3:21-26 to the Roman situation.

1. Purpose and contingency

Paul's purpose in writing Romans has been widely debated. The controversy has resulted from the letter's treatise-like nature, from the fact that its statements of purpose are by no means clear, /6 from the difficulty of reconciling what Paul says his purposes are with what he writes, /7 from the difficulty of determining Paul's familiarity with the Roman church, /8 and from the textual problems of ch.16. /9

Three lines of interpretation have been advanced for understanding Paul's purpose. One interpretation has concluded that the difficulties noted above prevent any articulation of contingency. Paul was writing a general theological treatise. Bornkamm thus designated the letter "Paul's last will and testament", arguing that "we are on the wrong tracks with the questions about the actual condition of the church at Rome." /10 While the content arose originally in the conflicts and issues Paul had previously confronted in his churches, in Romans it has lost its "occasional dress" and is worked out universally. /11

While such an approach reflects the universal nature of the thought, the carefully structured and developed argument, and the (supposed) lack of references to local church issues (contrast 1Cor), there are problems with it. Themes presented in other letters that do not appear in Romans (the body of Christ, the Lord's Supper) and content in Romans not used in other letters (justification by faith, baptism) do not allow the letter to be seen as a compendium of Paul's thought; the letter's own statements of purpose noted above are ignored in this formulation; and the fact that other Pauline letters are addressed to concrete situations encourages us to search for contingency in Romans also. /12

Secondly, several attempts have been made to identify the situation at Rome to which the letter was addressed. Klein has argued on the basis of 15.20 that Paul sought to lay a proper apostolic foundation for the church not founded by an apostle. /13 But this lacks exegetical support, faces the problem of Paul's complimentary remarks about the church

(1.8;15:14), and does not easily fit the stated purpose of a stopover on the way to Spain. P. Minear has argued that the Church at Rome was seriously divided into five factions and Paul's purpose was to reconcile the groups. /14 The strength of Minear's analysis is the degree of specificity he attempts in seeking the letter's context, yet it is also this specificity that renders his analysis vulnerable. Reconciling such extensive division with 1.8 and 15.14 is difficult, as is Minear's method of reading the descriptions of wrong attitudes, and the exhortations to right thinking in ch 14.15 as representing actual groups physically divided from each other. Such an identification is questionable in each instance but particularly so for groups four and five. Nor does Minear support his claim that "the disputes described in ch 14 are such as to have made common meetings impossible." /15 A comparison with Corinth indicates that it is precisely in the chaos of a meeting together that the divisions are revealed (1 Cor.8; 10.23-33;11.17-34)

Minear's analysis, though, does have the merit of alerting us to tensions (rather than divisions) in the Roman church. His identification of these along the broad lines of Jewish and Gentile Christians on the basis of 14-15.13, though not without problems, is essentially convincing.

A third approach situates the letter largely in relation to Paul's own circumstances. /17 Paul plans to visit Spain (15.24,28) with a stopover at Rome (15.24,29), but first he must visit Jerusalem with the collection, a visit that entails danger and the possibility of rejection of the collection (15.31). In the letter to Rome, Paul practises his defence of the gospel, and asks them for prayer and solidarity (15.30) with him as the apostle to the Gentiles (15.15). Acceptance of the collection by Jerusalem would signify the unity of the church, and the validity of Paul's gospel, apostleship and churches. But why should a letter preoccupied with Jerusalem go to Rome? Jervell points to Paul's travel plans to Spain, and his need to gain support for his gospel from Rome, the representative of the Gentile world. /18

Jervell's analysis highlights an important aspect of the letter's context in Paul's own circumstances and accounts for the reference to the Jerusalem visit (15.25-33). Its weakness, however, is in determining why this letter should be sent to Rome. Jervell's explanation of the representative nature of the Roman church is not convincing, given Paul's apparent lack of previous contact with the church, and it overlooks the specificity of the content of ch 14-15 as referring to a particular church situation.

J.C. Beker's discussion provides a more successful link of the Roman and Jerusalem situations. Beker identifies a "convergence of motivations" that indicate the letter's purposes. One important factor is the absence of Galatia from the list of contributors to the collection (15.26), suggesting a likely loss of support for Paul. This situation, plus Paul's Galatian letter, probably resulted in a deterioration of Paul's relationship with Jerusalem. It is also likely that a misrepresentation of his view of the place of Jews in salvation history had spread through his churches. Faced with these factors, as well as his own impending trip to Jerusalem where he would probably have to defend his ministry, and having heard of the conflicts between Jewish and Gentile Christians at Rome, Paul writes to them. The letter is intended to counter a betrayal of the gospel and a misrepresentation of his own position, as well as to prepare for a mission to Spain. In the face of disunity, he insists on the fundamental equality of Jew and Gentile "sola fide in the sola gratia of God's righteousness in Christ" and on a unity that "preserves the salvation-history priority of Israel." /19

Beker's insistence on a "convergence of motivations" has several strengths. It allows the diverse statements of purpose to be held together without elevating one and ignoring others. Paul is realistically recognized as being involved in several spheres - Rome and Jerusalem - at one time. Since the former is addressed, Rome will be uppermost in our attempt to understand the letter, but there is no competition of spheres since the issues facing Paul at both Jerusalem and Rome center on the relationships of Jewish and Gentile Christians. Thus our discuss-

ion of 3.21-26 will be more explicitly concerned with Rome, but Paul's relationship with Jerusalem must also be kept in view. We will now indicate three emphases Paul makes in 3.21-26 as he seeks to reconcile Jewish and Gentile Christians.

II

Emphasis I: The Equality of Jew and Gentile before God

Paul fills 3.21-26 with references to the unity and equality of Jew and Gentile before God. We will argue that Paul thereby seeks to counter the faulty thinking and divisive actions in the Roman church; the perception of such equality of status and treatment provides a basis for social equality and unity in the church, and removes any possible grounds (such as ethnicity) for divisive behaviour.

The emphasis on equality is introduced in the preceding section (1.16-3.20) where two themes have dominated. First, Paul has stressed that all human existence is revealed to be marred by sin (1.18). A striking amount of "comprehensive" language is evident - pas frequently occurs as all sin (1.18,29), affecting all human beings (2.19;3.9-12). We also have: comprehensive pairings (Ioudaioi/Hellēni 2.9;3.9; cf 1.16; and akrobugtia/peritomē - 2.25-29), /20 the generic anthrōpos (1.18;2.1) stressing equal sinfulness.

Secondly, the divine response to all (Jew and Gentile) who commit ungodliness (2.2-3) is impartial judgment. /21 There is no escape or privileged treatment on the basis of ethnicity. election or gift. for those who disobey tē alētheia (the truth) (2.8,12). Having the law but not doing it means nothing other than God's judgment (2.12-24) on Gentiles (1.32) and Jews (2.5). There is no partiality in God's eyes (2.11); "the whole world" (pas ho kosmos) is "accountable" (hupodikos) to God (3.19; cf 3.9). The catena in 3.10-18 supplies scriptural authority for the argument. The judge can do no other than condemn all humankind for its sinfulness (3.20)

Just as sinfulness and condemnation are universal, so too is God's saving act (dikaio sunē theou). Its means [chōris nomou (apart from law), en christō (in Christ)]

and its required response (pistis:faith) accentuate universality, providing the basis for unity and equitable social relations in the Roman church.

Dikaiosunē theou (3.21) has been widely debated, being understood as God's gift to human beings of the status of righteousness, /22 or as God's apocalyptic saving power and action. /23 Several issues have been to the fore - whether to construe the genitive theou as subjective or objective; /24 how to interpret the history of religions material; /25 how much diversity exists within the concept. /26 It is not our intention to enter into the debate, except to indicate that we will utilize Käsemann's subjective genitive reading. Instead, our focus is on the term's "social function and implications."

Immediately to be observed is that dikaiosunē theou must be related to Paul's preceding argument. /27 Important to note are the series of antitheses of 3.1-8 where human and divine qualities are contrasted, particularly the contrast of the faithlessness of humans with God's faithfulness. /28 We have already observed Paul's emphasis on the universal scope of human sin; dikaiosunē theou continues the same focus, though, by way of contrast, depicting God's universal and faithful saving action.

The reference to God's faithfulness raises the question - to what is God being faithful? Stuhlmacher has suggested, unconvincingly, that creation is in view, while Hays has argued that God is being faithful to his covenant promises. /29 Williams also thinks Paul is referring to the promises God had graciously made to Abraham, that Abraham would be the father of many nations. /30 In revealing his saving power (dikaiosunē thou) God is faithful to promises that embrace all humankind; his saving activity has a universal focus, embracing Jew and Gentile. In such equality of treatment before God lies a further foundation for reconciliation and unity in the church at Rome.

Further, the revelation of God's saving activity has been manifested chōris nomou: "apart from law" (3.21). Many discussions have noted that the reference to this dimension of the manifestation is necessary following 3.30 and results from "the internal logic of Paul's argument." Paul

had concluded the previous section by declaring that the Mosaic law brings epignōsis hamartias (knowledge of sin). (3.20; cf 5.20). This is the awareness that "the moral order is a rebellion, a transgression, an act against God, and an infidelity to the covenant relation and stipulations formulated in the Decalogue." /31 Although the law brings knowledge of God's will (2.18), knowledge without obedience is condemnation (2.20-24). The law cannot empower obedience since it lacks the dunamis (power) of life that the gospel brings (1.16), having instead the dunamis of sin (cf 1 Cor 15.56). Therefore if life is to be attained, if the saving promises are to be kept, a manifestation apart from the law is required.

But when the contingent circumstances of the letter are kept in mind, a further social dimension becomes evident. The law was a gift particularly to Israel (2.17-24), but given the universality of both sin and promise to Israel (Chs 3 & 4), God's saving action must be revealed to all chōris nomou. With this phrase Paul again reminds the Christians in conflict in Rome that neither Jew nor Gentile has any advantage or preference in God's eyes. There is thus no basis for excluding behaviour or attitudes of superiority in the church. Rather, God's gracious /32 saving act en Christō has provided the basis for social unity and reconciliation

The saving act, the act of universal deliverance (3.24), /33 is effected in and through the death of Jesus Christ. Paul's formula en Christō /34 is particularly appropriate here, signifying not only the instrumentality by which the manifestation was made, but also the sphere and new allegiance of existence in the new age. Life en Christō is life determined by the saving event. It embraces a new quality of life, including social relationships. To be en Christō is to be one (heis), to be oukIoudaios oude Hellēn (Neither Jew nor Greek) (Gal. 3.28; cf 1 Cor 12.13; Rom 12.4). In the sphere of God's saving action and Lordship is the end of divisions and barriers; the saving action is not just directed towards individuals but has corporate expression, in the unity of Jew and Gentile in the church at Rome (and between Gentile churches and Jerusalem).

Paul's emphasis on "faith" in Jesus Christ (3.22,25,26) is also important for the Roman situation. God's action in Christ in fulfilling the promise to Abraham does not take effect in human lives either automatically, or ex ergōn nomou (on basis of works of the law) (3.20). By contrast to human striving and pride (kauxasai - 2.17;3.27) faith receives and depends on God's saving act.

The Roman tensions are addressed by this emphasis in two ways. Here faith is not the exclusive response of Jew or Greek. God's saving act in Christ is revealed eis pantas tous pisteuontas (to all who believe) (3.22). Pantas is emphatic and universal, not confined to ethnic boundaries or subject to claims on God's favour (22b). Jew and Gentile stand before God and beside one another in making this common response to God's gracious and impartial act. And secondly, while faith involves receptivity to God's activity and presence, it does not mean passivity. Receptivity entails active obedience; the gift calls and enables humans for service. /37 Hence as well as the noun pistis (faith) (22a), the participle pisteuontas (22b) is employed. The verb form maintains the focus on activity, while the present tense highlights continuous obedience.

Later in the letter, Paul states explicitly what such a way of life involves. Paul calls the Romans to unity en heni sōmati (in one body) (12.4). They are to please (15.2,3), to welcome (15.7), to love (12.10), but not to despise or judge (14.4,5,10,13) one another. Such unity is not uniformity- there is diversity in the expressions of God's grace in service (12.6) nor does Paul forbid the diverse practices and convictions of the "weak" and the "strong" (14.5-6) even though he does insist on tolerant attitudes and relationships. At Rome where God's saving act in Christ is known, where Christ's lordship is acknowledged, there should be such unity and a new social reality (cf Gal 3.28).

Emphasis 2: Jewish Temporal Priority

A second emphasis accompanies the focus on unity and universality. God's saving act takes place in continuity

with God's dealings with the Jewish people in the past. As new and as discontinuous as God's act may seem (en tō nun kairō (at the present time -3.21,26), Jewish temporal priority is upheld

This emphasis appears first in 3.21. While God's saving power has been manifested chōris nomou, salvation history has not been breached since the saving act is witnessed to hupo tou nomou kai tōn prophetōn (by the law and the prophets). Continuity is established in that the OT scriptures bear witness to this act. /38 Various suggestions have been made as to the nature of the continuity. One view is that the scripture created the situation which necessitated the new manifestation by defining sin and by showing the impossibility of finding zōē (life) by works of the law. The catena of 3.10-18 illustrates this concept. /39 Others suggest that particular OT prophecies, especially messianic ones, are in mind. /40 J.C. Beker refers specifically to the promise to Abraham (4.1-12 and the midrash on Gen 15.6). /41 While the general links are not to be ruled out, this specific reference to Abraham merits a prominent place given his significance in ch.4, and the other links with 3.21-26 noted above. The Jewish scriptures thus point to God's saving action in Christ. The notion of priority and universality expressed in the formula Ioudaiō to prōton kai Hellēni (2.9) with regard to sin, are here stated in relation to salvation (so 1.16)

Other elements of continuity with Jewish traditions are evident. The prominent role of the Jewish patriarch, the recipient of the promise of universal blessing, has been noted. So too has Käsemann's (disputed) claim for the influence of Jewish apocalyptic thought in the phrase dikaïosunē theou (righteousness of God) Jewish cultic ritual from the Jerusalem temple is also seen by some to provide a further figure whereby the act's meaning can be articulated. Jesus is the hilastērion (3.25), the mercy-seat, the place in the Holy of Holies of God's presence and self-disclosure. In Jesus' death, (en tō autou haimati: lit. in his blood) revelation is manifested and atonement accomplished. A recognition of this emphasis on Jewish temporal priority in 3.25-26 offers

one explanation among others, for Paul's use of this earlier formulation. /43

Why should Paul make this emphasis in his letter? Several scenarios can be suggested. Perhaps the success of the Gentile mission and the comparative non-response of Jewish people has led some Gentile Christians to suggest arrogantly that Israel was disqualified from the divine plan (11.1-12, 25-32). Stendahl comments that Paul "has an eerie feeling about the attitudes he discerned among many Gentile Christians to Jews. Thus he set himself the task to break an attitude of condescension (11.25)." /44 Paul counters such claims by asserting that the route to God's universal saving act was via Jewish temporal priority. Gentiles have been included but Jews have not been excluded. Or perhaps Paul's teaching about the law has led to a misunderstanding and accusation that he saw Israel as now having no place in God's economy, and that God was now on the side of the Gentiles, having rejected Israel. Against these charges of discontinuity and Gentile partisanship, Paul affirms divine impartiality, equality of Jew and Gentile in the new age; and Jewish temporal priority. The accusations and controversies over lifestyle in ch 14-15 suggest that some Jewish and Gentile Christians may well have doubted the other's right to be part of the ekklēsia (14.3,4,8,10,13; 15.7,8-12). Paul reminds these Christians of the universality of God's saving action, and of its continuity with God's dealings with Israel in the past. There is thus no reason for haughty, excluding or judgmental attitudes and behaviour at Rome; rather there should be unity, acceptance and love.

Emphasis 3: The Visibility of God's Acts

A third emphasis in this passage is that of the historical concreteness and visibility of the manifestation of God's saving power in Christ. Pephanerōtai (has been manifested v21) introduces this emphasis. The verb is a synonym of apokaluptein (reveal) /45, denoting literally an "unveiling" or "uncovering". God's saving power has been uncovered or revealed for Paul in the death/resurr-

ection of Jesus, and in its proclamation [nuni(now) -vs21; en tō nun kairō (in the present time) -vs26]. Three references - Iēsou Christou (3.22), Christō Iēsou (v24), Iēsou (v26) - maintain the focus on the crucified one in whose death (en tō autou haimati) redemption is found (v25) Proetheto (v25) (put forward) maintains the emphasis on a discernible and visible act with its sense of public display; in Jesus' death God has publicly displayed and executed his saving power and will. /46 In this act God has been able to "show forth and vindicate", to "demonstrate" /47 (endeixis - 3.25,26) his righteousness. The vocabulary thus emphasizes the public and visible unveiling of God's gracious saving will and power, in the death of Christ.

Why should Paul emphasize the manifestation of God's righteousness in a person and event, in an "earthly epiphany?" /48 Because, Käsemann argues, the revelation of God's saving power can occur no other way; dikaïosunē theou is manifested on earth only in visible acts of service. Such actions result only when "God's power takes possession of us andenters us;" since power is gift, address means service and obligation derives from Lordship. God's sovereign power and Lordship call and empower us for concrete acts of service and daily obedience. /49

Paul's thrust is, then, that God's saving power should be manifested with visible effect amongst God's people at Rome. Unity is one such expression of dikaïosunē theou since God's saving act is universal and impartial, based in and expressive of his own unity (so 3.29-30). Visible displays of God's saving power would also mean reconciliation between Jew and Gentile Christians at Rome (14.1-15.13), and active expressions of love and service, both there (12.3-8) and in the reception of the Gentile collection by the Jerusalem church (15.16-31). The challenge for the church at Rome (and beyond to Jerusalem) is to express visibly in the social relationships the universality and unity expressed in God's gracious and universal act.

We have argued that contingency is an important and hitherto neglected dimension in the discussions of Rom. 3.21-26. We have indicated that Romans was composed

from a convergence of motivations related to both the Roman church and to Paul's larger mission. A common factor in these situations was tension in the relationships of Jewish and Gentile Christians, and we have argued that in 3.21-26 Paul addresses this issue. We have noted three emphases, and have explored them, not so much in terms of the wider context of Paul's coherent theology, but in relation to the contingency of the Roman situation. The emphases on the universality of God's saving act, on Jewish temporal priority, and on the visibility and concreteness of God's saving power address directly tensions between Jewish and Gentile Christians at Rome, and challenge the community to manifest the reality of God's saving power in acts of reconciliation, unity and service. /50

Notes

1. W.A. Maier, "Paul's Concept of Justification and Some Recent Interpretations of Romans 3.21-31." The Springfielder 37 (1974) 248-68
2. R. Hays, "Psalm 143 and the Logic of Romans 3," JBL 99 (1980) 107-115
3. For example P. Stuhlmacher, "Recent Exegesis on Romans 3.24-26," Reconciliation, Law and Righteousness (Philadelphia: Fortress; 1986) 94-109
4. J.C. Beker, Paul the Apostle (Philadelphia: Fortress 1980) ch.3. In employing these terms Beker refers to the "peculiar inter-relation of 'catholicity' and 'particularity'" (28) which has often seen an emphasis on the general coherence of Paul's thought at the expense of the occasional and historical concreteness (contingency).
5. So N. Dahl, "The Doctrine of Justification: Its Social Function and Implications," Studies in Paul (Minneapolis: Augsburg; 1977) 95-120 esp 95. He did not, though, discuss the social implications for the Roman situation.
6. In 1.10-12 Paul desires to come to Rome, yet Spain is his goal (15.24). At 1.13 he intends to conduct mission activity in Rome, but at 15.20 he declares he does not want to build on another's foundation.
7. In between the statements about Rome (1.10-13) and Spain (15.24) is the extended theological statement of ch 1-11.
8. He says he has not been to Rome (1.13), yet greets over 20 people in ch.16
9. The doxology of 16.23 appears in some mss at 14.23 or 15.33 (P46). The ms support for 14.23 is one factor that has led some to see

ch.16 as part of a letter to Ephesus. See T.W. Manson, "St Paul's Letter to the Romans - and Others" in K. Donfried (ed), The Romans Debate; (Minneapolis; Augsburg; 1977) 1-16. Donfried convincingly replies in Ch.4

10. G. Bornkamm, "The Letter to the Romans as Paul's Last Will and Testament," Romans Debate 17-31, esp 22
11. Bornkamm, op.cit. 23,28-29
12. K. Donfried, "False Assumptions in the Study of Romans," Romans Debate 120-148, esp 122
13. G. Klein, "Paul's Purpose in writing the Epistle to the Romans," Romans Debate ch.3
14. P. Minear, The Obedience of Faith (London SCM 1971) 1-35
15. Minear, op.cit. 8
16. Minear, op.cit.9-10 notes several weaknesses. Against the identification of the "weak" as Jewish Christians is 14.2 (eat only vegetables) and 14.21 (refuse to drink wine). By way of explanation, he argues the former may reflect a polemical statement, or the practice in social settings of avoiding meat for fear of it not being kosher. The latter he attributes to avoiding lawless excess and guilt by association with drunken Gentile Christians. He also concedes that the "weak" may include Gentiles (9) and the "strong" may include Jewish Christians who had thrown off the law (11). Thus for Minear the division is largely but not exclusively ethnic. R.J. Karris ("The Occasion of Romans," Romans Debate) seems to press these difficulties too far and rigidly in concluding no ethnic division existed. Minear's position has also been advocated by W. Marxsen [Introduction to the NT (Philadelphia, Fortress 1968) 95-104]
17. J. Jervell, "The Letter to Jerusalem," Romans Debate 61-74
18. Jervell, op.cit. 73-74. E.P. Sanders, (Paul, the Law and the Jewish People [Philadelphia, Fortress 1983] 31) also minimalizes the Roman situation, emphasizing relations of Jewish and Gentile Christians in respect of Jerusalem and the Galatian difficulties.
19. J.C. Beker, op.cit. 71-76, esp 74. S.K. Williams ("Righteousness of God in Romans," JBL 99 [1980] 241-90) has a similar statement of "multiple motivations" (254-55) - i) the Jerusalem trip and defence of his ministry; ii) a "theological resumé" to gain support for the Spanish mission; iii) a theological basis for his parenesis of 12-14 directed to conflict at Rome.
20. See J. Marcus, "Circumcision! Foreskin! The Contingent Character of Romans" (forthcoming) who argues that these were terms of abuse used by the two groups.
21. See J. Bassler, Divine Impartiality (Chico Scholars 1982).
22. R. Bultmann, Theology of the NT I (London SCM 1952) 270-87; idem "DIKAIOSUNE THEOU," JBL 83 (1964) 12-16; C.E. Cranfield, The Epistle to the Romans I (Edinburgh T&T Clark 1975) 91-9, 202; G. Klein, IDB Supp.Vol. (Nashville Abingdon 1976) 750-752
23. E. Kasemann, " 'The Righteousness of God' in Paul", NT Questions of Today (Philadelphia Fortress 1969) 168-182; M. Soards, "The Righteousness of God in the Writings of the Apostle Paul," BTB 14-15 (1984-1985) 104-9; M.T. Brauch, "Perspectives on 'God's Righteousness' in Recent German Discussion," Appendix in E.P. Sanders, Paul and Palestinian Judaism (Philadelphia, Fortress 1977) 523-42; J.C. Beker, op.cit 262-64.

24. A key difficulty has been one of method. Käsemann ("Righteousness" 172) complains that Bultmann equated dth with "righteousness" and so ensured a focus on gift and human status (an objective genitive). Reversing this, Käsemann subsumes "righteousness" to dth, arguing that dth must be treated as a "terminus technicus" and as the central concept to which the cognates belong but with which they are not identical in meaning. Such an approach emphasizes divine activity. Käsemann's subjective genitive seems a more convincing reading of Paul's usage (1.17; 3.5,25; 10.3; 2 Cor 5.21). His use of parallel concepts of divine activity and power (1.17; 5.21; 6.13,18; 10.3; 1 Cor 1.30; Gal 2.20) offers support from the wider context of Paul's thought, with its cosmic and apocalyptic view of God's activity rather than an individualistic and anthropocentric understanding.
25. Käsemann argued that in early Judaism and Qumran dth was a technical term for God's activity. But this has been disputed since Käsemann cannot produce many unambiguous examples - E.P. Sanders (PPJ 305-12) argues that the Qumran passages do not mean "salvation power" but "Mercy". M. Soards ("Käsemann's 'Righteousness' Reexamined," CBO 49 [1987] 264-7) has cast doubt on the T. Dan 6.10 reference; Bultmann ("DIKAIOSUNE THEOU") is not convinced it is a technical term, but argues it was "ein Neuschöpfung des Paulus". R. Hays ("Psalm 143" 108) has proposed a way through the impasse, from the use of Ps 143 and the logic of Paul's thought in ch 3 that the term means "God's own salvation-creating power."
26. Against Bultmann's focus on gift and human status, Käsemann (ibid, 171-2) delineates a more comprehensive concept, combining "present and future eschatology, 'declare righteous' and 'make righteous', gift and service, freedom and obedience, forensic, sacramental and ethical approaches." Käsemann is concerned to locate the unitary centre for these dimensions
- 27/28 R. Hays, 109-115; Williams 265-80. N28 Hays 114; Williams, 268
29. Stuhlmacher, op.cit 81; idem Gottesgerechtigkeit bei Paulus (Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1965) 86-91; Hays, op.cit. 111. Hays notes (Fn 17. point 2) against Stuhlmacher that Paul appeals not to creation but "to the universal implication of the promise to Abraham."
30. Williams, op.cit. 266-69
31. J. Fitzmyer, "Paul and the Law", To Advance the Gospel (Ny, Crossroad 181) 190
32. V24 stresses that the saving act is not motivated by any human claim (achievement, ethnicity) on God. It derives from and expresses God's grace (dōrean, chariti); it is God's active eschatological power ("eschatologische Macht"). E. Käsemann, An die Römer (Tübingen, J.C. Mohr [Paul Siebeck] 1974) 90
33. For discussion of apolutrōsis, see C.K. Barrett, A Commentary on Romans (London, A&C Black, 1957); F. Büchsel, TDNT IV (Grand Rapids, Eerdmans, 1967) 351-356; Cranfield, op.cit. 206-7; L. Morris, "Redemption", The Apostolic Preaching of the Cross (3rd edit, Grand Rapids, Eerdmans, 1980) 11-64, esp 40-51
34. See A. Oepke, TDNT II, 1964, 541-543; F. Neugebauer, Das Paulinische 'In Christo', NTS 4 (1957-58) 124-38; A.J.M. Wedderburn, "Some Observations on Paul's use of the Phrase 'in Christ' and 'with Christ'", JSNT 25 (1985) 93-97

35. I take these as objective (so Käsemann, op.cit; Cranfield, Barrett, op.cit) Williams, op.cit. 272-275 and L.T. Johnson ("Romans 3.21-26 and the faith of Jesus" CBO 44 [1982]77-90) read them as subjective genitives, referring to Jesus' faith in God. Against this i) Paul does not use Iēsous as the subject of pisteuō; ii) Iēsou in 3.26 need not indicate the earthly Jesus - cf 1 Thess 1.10, and the synonymous Iēsous and Christos in Rom 8.11 and 2 Cor 4.10-14; iii) in 3.21-26 the objective genitive appropriately indicates in whom faith is to be placed as the human response to God's saving act.
36. Kauchomai ("boast" or "exult") denotes self-confidence and glorying one's own efforts, which is brought to nought by God's saving act in Christ (3.27). See R. Bultmann, TDNT III, op.cit. 648-53
37. E. Käsemann, Righteousness, 174-177
38. For other examples, 1.2; ch.4; 9.25-33; 10.16-21; 11.1-10,26-29; 15.8-17; See Cranfield, op.cit. 202
39. Williams, op.cit 271
40. In part Barrett, op.cit.73
41. Beker, op.cit. 81
42. For discussion, Stuhlmacher, op.cit. esp 96-103; E. Lohse, Märtyrer und Gottesknecht (Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1963) 149ff and "Die Gerechtigkeit in der paulinischen Theologie," Die Einheit des Neuen Testaments (Göttingen, 1973) 209-227 esp 220ff
43. In support of a unit comprising 3.24-26, see R. Bultmann, Theology 154; E. Käsemann, "Zum Verständnis von Römer 3.24-26", ZNW 43 (1950-51); in favour of 3.25-26a, B. Meyer, "The Pre-Pauline Formula in Romans 3.25-26a, NTS 29 (1983) 198-208; Stuhlmacher, op.cit. 94-109. C. Talbert's suggestion of a post-Pauline addition ("A Non-Pauline Fragment at Romans 3.24-26?" JBL 85 [1966] 287-96) lacks textual support, and his reconstruction leaves the nominative masculine plural participle dikaïoumenoi (24) unattached, since kauchēsis (boasting) (27) is a feminine singular noun.
44. K. Stendahl, "A Response," USQR 33 (1978) 189-191, esp 190; also E.P. Sanders, "Paul's Attitude Towards the Jewish People," USQR 33 (1978) 175-187; N. Dahl, "The Future of Israel," Studies in Paul, 137-58
45. phaneron estin (1.19) occurs after apokaluptetai in 1.17,18
46. With Barrett Romans 77; Käsemann, Römer 91; Stuhlmacher, "Recent Exegesis," 102
47. Barrett's translations (Romans, 79) express the "ambiguity" of endeixis, a "showing forth" and a "proof". W.G. Kummel (Paresis und Endeixis: Ein Beitrag zum Verständnis der paulinischen Rechtfertigungslehre, "ZTK" 49 [1952] 154-67) emphasizes "demonstration" rather than "proof". So also Stuhlmacher, op.cit.95, contra Cranfield, op.cit.211
48. Käsemann, Righteousness, 173
49. *ibid*, 173-176; the language ("us") indicates Käsemann is not concerned with the contingency of the letter in his discussion.
50. My thanks to Dr. Joel Marcus for his response to a previous draft of this article.

Does 1 Corinthians 15 Hold Water?

J.M. Ross

The fifteenth chapter of 1 Corinthians is one of the most familiar chapters in the Bible. It is often read on Easter Day and at funerals. It gives comfort to many because it appears to tackle what is a real problem to people in the twentieth century - the problem of survival after death. The age in which we live is so heavily influenced by the scientific viewpoint that it finds it difficult to believe that life after death is possible. The great attraction of Spiritualism is that it professes to give proof of such life; and the same comfort is found in the fifteenth chapter of 1 Corinthians, which seems to give assurance that the life of our loved ones is not extinguished at death, and we can hope to rejoin them in another existence beyond the grave.

Unfortunately this is not what the apostle Paul is arguing about in this chapter. Our first task, therefore, is to discover what it was that Paul was really contending against.

A number of options were open to the Christians at Corinth. (1) They might hold the Epicurean view that survival after death is impossible.

(2) They might hold the similar Sadducean view, though it is unlikely that many Jews in the Greek milieu of Corinth would hold to the ancient Jewish belief preserved by the Sadducees.

(3) They might hold the Pharisaic view that at the end of time there would be a general resurrection, or at least a resurrection of all believers.

(4) They might hold the Stoic belief that at death the individual soul was re-absorbed into the world-soul.

(5) They might hold the common Greek belief, preserved in the Platonic tradition, that the soul is inherently immortal and at death is freed from imprisonment in the body, so that it can enjoy for ever a bodiless and therefore perfect existence.

It would appear from Paul's argument in 1 Cor.15 that it was the last of these positions that was in his view wrongly held by some of the Corinthian Christians.

They believed in immortality but not in a bodily resurrection. Doubtless this was the view condemned at 2 Tim.2.18 in the statement that Hymenaeus and Philetus erroneously believed the resurrection to have taken place already. That the Corinthian objectors believed in survival after death is clear from their practice by which some converts to Christianity were baptized on behalf of their deceased relatives (verse 29); that they doubted whether there could be a bodily resurrection is evident from the objection dealt with at verse 35 -- "How are the dead raised? With what body do they come?"

It is clear, therefore, that 1 Cor. was written not to prove the immortality of the soul but to prove the bodily resurrection of the dead, presumably at the second coming of Christ, which was expected shortly. To convince the Corinthians of this resurrection Paul begins the chapter by reminding them of the essentials of the Christian belief (a primitive creed not in Pauline style which includes the resurrection of Jesus); he follows this with a recital of the evidence for Jesus' resurrection, to show that there are solid grounds for this belief; he then argues that because Christ was raised from the dead it is impossible to contend that there is no resurrection, and then proceeds to refute objections

This is not the only place where Paul used the resurrection of Christ as proof of the resurrection of others. At Rom.8.11 (in the context of the Holy Spirit) he declared that "if the Spirit of him who raised Jesus from the dead dwells in you, he who raised Jesus Christ from the dead will give life also to your mortal bodies through the Spirit that dwells in you." At 2 Cor.4.14 he wrote, "We know that he who raised the Lord Jesus will raise us also with Jesus and present us to him with you." St. Luke must have known of this argument because at Acts 4.2 he says that the Sadducees and others were greatly disturbed because Peter and John were teaching the people and proclaiming in Jesus the resurrection from the dead.

But we now have to ask whether this argument would have convinced the Corinthian sceptics. It does not necessarily follow from the resurrection of Jesus that disbelief in the bodily resurrection of others is

illogical. Christ was unique. According to the Gospels he was born of a virgin, he could still a storm, walk on water, wither a fig-tree and bring back dead people to life. It could be argued that what is true of Jesus is not necessarily true of ordinary Christians. He had to be raised from the dead in order to demonstrate his divinity, but in the case of his followers there was no such necessity.

Supposing that the Corinthian objectors had on this ground felt that Paul's reasoning did not hold water, how would Paul have replied? I suggest that his reply would have taken the following line.

"Your objection would be valid if there were a clean separation between Christ and his people. But this is not the case. Christ and his church are fused together, so that whatever is true of the one is true of the other. That is what we mean by saying that we are in Christ and Christ is in us. When the risen Christ appeared to me on the road to Damascus he did not ask me why I was persecuting his church, but 'Why are you persecuting me?.. ..I am Jesus whom you are persecuting.' (Acts 9.4,5). The church is the temple in which Christ dwells (2 Cor. 6.16). The bodies of Christians are organs of Christ (1 Cor.6.15)."

At other places in 1 Cor. Paul practically identifies Christ and the Church. At 1.13, after reprimanding the factions in the Corinthian Church, he might be expected to ask, "Is the Church divided?", but in fact he asks, "Is Christ divided?" At 12.12 after comparing the Church to the human body, he wrote: "Just as the body is one and has many members, and all the members of the body, though they are many, are one body. so also" -- and we might expect Paul to say, "so also is the Church", but in fact he says, "so also is Christ." Similarly, at 10.16 he says that the cup of blessing which we bless and the bread which we break are not merely a fellowship meal between Christians (as many people today might say), but are a participation in the blood and body of Christ. Thus, in Paul's thinking, Christ and his Church are so intimately conjoined that whatever is true of Christ is true of his people. If he rose from the dead, then his people must rise too. The resurrection of Christ was only the aparchē, the first-fruits (15.20). It would be

unthinkable that he would rise from the dead and not take his people along with him.

The same conjunction of Christ and his Church is found in Paul's references to suffering. At Phil.3.10, he says he desires not only to know the power of Christ's resurrection but also to share in his sufferings, for the sufferings of the Church are the sufferings of Christ and the sufferings of Christ are the sufferings of his Church. At 2 Cor.1.5 he says that the sufferings of Christ flow over into our lives, and at Col 1.24 he claims to fill up in his flesh what is lacking in the sufferings of Christ for the sake of his body which is the Church.

The question raised in this paper has not been much discussed in commentaries on First Corinthians, but Richard Kugelman in the Jerome Bible Commentary points out that "The glorious resurrection of the body is a consequence of incorporation into the risen Christ," and Margaret Thrall, in her commentary on 1.Cor. points out that both in ch.15 and in Rom.5.12-21 Paul uses the analogy of Adam to argue that what happened to Jesus affects his followers as well; what happened to him affects potentially the whole human race. Christians are the body of Christ, included within his personality, so that his experience of resurrection will become theirs.

No doubt the connection between Christ and his Church, almost to the point of identification, was so obvious to Paul that he did not think it necessary to make it a proof of the resurrection in ch,15, but if we bring it in on Paul's behalf then we can say that the chapter can hold water.

This paper has been concerned simply to elucidate what Paul said to the Corinthians. Whether we today believe that the departed still have to wait till the general resurrection before receiving bodies, or that they receive the bodies immediately at death, and whether this applies to all mankind or only to Christians, are questions outside the scope of this paper.

The Growth of Christianity over the first Five Centuries
in the Light of Jewish Faith /1

E.A. Russell

It is a special privilege to be invited by the Irish School of Ecumenics and the Irish Council of Christians and Jews to share in this annual Conference especially as it takes place in the Jewish Museum. I have happy memories of visits here on other occasions. The theme offered to me covers an extensive period, reaching from the date of the birth of Jesus, say, in 6 BC and culminating in the Council of Chalcedon in 451 AD - a formidable task for the narrow confines of one lecture. /2 For my purpose the concentration will be rather on the earlier centuries especially where they become definitive for the later period.

Christianity was born within Judaism. It took over what Dr Cecil Roth calls "Hebrew's greatest gift to humanity", the concept of one God, Creator of earth. As such, it spelt an end to polytheism and, as he expresses it, "The ideas of the value of human life, the sanctity of the home and the dignity of the marital relationship.....are essentially a biblical heritage" /3 It is scarcely necessary to add that such ideas are precisely what characterizes Christianity. We might further add that the God of Israel was a God of righteousness and again and again the Hebrew prophets express this passion for righteousness i.e., justice, truth and morality. Isaiah speaks for the prophets when he says:

Bring no more vain offerings; incense is an abomination to me...
Your new moons and appointed feasts, my soul hates;
Wash yourselves; make yourselves clean;
remove the evil of your doings from before my eyes;
cease to do evil; learn to do good;
seek justice, correct oppression;
defend the fatherless, plead for the widow. (1.13,14,16-17)

He highlights also that such a God is a God of mercy, of enduring love. It was in the context of such a faith that Jesus was born.

For information about Jesus our main sources are of course the Christian Gospels of Mark, Matthew, Luke and John. It is here we get impressive confirmation of the

Jewishness of Jesus. It is notable that we do not get much information about the historical Jesus in the epistles of Paul - his stress lies on the significance of the death and resurrection of Jesus - or indeed other epistles. It may be presumed of course their readers would have a basic knowledge of the historical Jesus.

Jewish scholars have been fascinated with the story of Jesus, the Jew. They include scholars of a past generation, e.g., C.G. Montefiore /4 and Joseph Klausner/5 and, more recently, Dr Geza Vermes, Professor David Flusser and the American scholar, Dr Samuel Sandmel. /6

The name "Jesus" /7 is an English transliteration of the Greek form. The original Hebrew form was Joshua or, more fully, Yehoshuah (= "Yahweh is salvation" or "Yahweh saves" or "will save"). The significance of the name was not overlooked by Matthew: "You will call his name Jesus (Joshua) for he will save his people from their sins"(1.21). Such a name is, of course, thoroughly Jewish. Further, Matthew gives us his family tree, noting that it goes back to Abraham, the supreme example to the Jews of the complete Hebrew, the Father of the Faithful.

The evidence suggests that Jesus was brought up in an observant Jewish home i.e., a home that adhered to the Jewish law. In Matthew's gospel, Jesus' father is described as dikaïos, "righteous" i.e., as one who is faithful to the law of righteousness, the Torah. We have confirmation of this: Jesus was circumcized on the eighth day as laid down by the law (Luke 2.21); he was offered as the first-born to God in the Temple and redeemed or bought back by the required gift from the parents of five shekels (Exodus 13.1-2, 11-15; Numbers 17.10). Dr Wm Manson writes: "The scrupulousness with which this rite and the other requirements of the Mosaic law are said to have been observed reminds us not merely that Christ was 'born under the law', but that Christianity is the fulfilment of Judaism". /8 Jesus was fortunate to be born in the era of the synagogue, a Jewish institution going back to Babylon perhaps as early as the sixth century BC. /9 It was set up for the reading of scripture and for prayer. It was at times simply called proseuchē, "prayer". The tradition of scripture reading and

exposition and prayer is taken over by the Christian Church over the centuries. Jesus, we read, faithfully attended the synagogue on the Sabbath day "as his custom was." (Lk 4.16)

The portrait presented to us by Matthew shows a Jesus who holds strictly to the law. This is evident when he speaks about adherence to the law which some alleged perhaps he was breaking. "Think not that I have come to abolish the law and the prophets; I have not come to abolish them but to fulfil them." (5.17). When he comes to expand the full meaning of the Hebrew law, the way he speaks reminds us of the "Thus saith the Lord" of the prophets: "You have heard that it was said to the men of old but I say to you" (Mt 5.21,27ff). Jesus' adherence to the law comes out on numerous occasions e.g., he is not content that the leper has been cleansed but insists that he follow out the instruction of the law and show himself to the priest to certify the cure (Mk 1.41ff). It is Matthew also who shows us that Jesus confines his mission to the Jew. "I have been sent", says Jesus, "only to the lost sheep of the house of Israel." (15.24) On the matter of faithful observance of the Sabbath regulations, the only area where he appears to break it has to do with healing, e.g. the man with the withered hand. (Mk 3.1-6 and par.) /10

At every point, it would appear, we are confronted with a Jesus who is shaped by the traditions of his people even if he interprets them in a fresh and original way. The radical teaching of the so-called "Sermon on the Mount (Luke stages it on a plain) has parallels in the best thought of Jesus' day. Some of the sayings are of course taken almost straight from the Hebrew scriptures. When Jesus says, "Blessed are the meek for they shall inherit the earth" (5.5), he recalls Psalm 37 vs 11: "But the meek shall inherit the earth and delight themselves in abundant prosperity." When he says "Blessed are the pure in heart, for they shall see God" (5.8), he recalls Psalm 24. 3-5: "Who shall ascend into the hill of God or who shall stand in his holy place? He who has clean hands and a pure heart, who does not lift up his soul to what is false, and does not swear deceitfully. He will receive blessing

from the Lord." Even the literary form "blessed..." shows its debt to the original Hebrew. There it is an exclamation, "Oh, the blessedness of" found e.g., in Psalm 1.1: "Oh the blessedness of the man who walks not in the counsel of the ungodly" where it may be, since the Psalm is placed at the beginning of the Psalms, it is implied that the theme of the Psalms has to do with the blessed or happy man i.e., the godly. Another example of this literary form can be located in Psalm 32.1: "Oh the blessedness of the man whose transgression is forgiven, whose sin is covered." /11

And what about the Lord's Prayer or the so-called Pater Noster? /12 It is claimed that it "appears to be an epitome....an abbreviated version of the Eighteen Benedictions." /13 The Jewish scholar I. Abrahams, in his two-volume work, Studies in Pharisaism and the Gospels (reprinted., New York, 1967; II, 98-99), has culled lines from various Jewish prayers to shape the following mosaic with its many echoes of the phrases in the Lord's Prayer:

Our Father, who art in Heaven, Hallowed be Thine exalted Name
in the world thou didst create according to Thy will.

May thy Kingdom and Thy Lordship come speedily,
and be acknowledged by all the world, that Thy Name may be praised
in all eternity.

May Thy will be done in Heaven, and also on earth give tranquillity
of spirit to those that fear Thee, yet in all things do what seemeth
good to Thee.

Let us enjoy the bread daily apportioned to us.

Forgive us, our Father, for we have sinned; forgive also all who have
done us injury; even as we also forgive all.

And lead us not into temptation, but keep us far from evil.

For Thine is the greatness and the power and the dominion, the victory
and the majesty, yea in all Heaven and on earth.

Thine is the Kingdom, and Thou art lord of all beings for ever. Amen

Abrahams insists that if the Lord's prayer was "composed under the inspiration of Hebraic ideas, modelled to a large extent on Jewish forms, it was not in its primitive form a mosaic but a whole and fresh design." /14 The special quality of the prayer may be described as its simplicity and intimacy, its compactness and its manner of looking to the future. /15

The summary of Jesus' message as presented in Matthew lays stress on repentance: "Repent, for the Kingdom of Heaven

has drawn near." (4.17; cf Mark 1.15; Mt 3.2). There are in this brief sentence no less than three Jewish aspects we may note. 1. The prophets often spoke of the day of the Lord and looked forward to the time when God's sovereign rule would be consummated. Obadiah e.g., speaks of the day of the Lord being near among all the nations (vs 15): "Saviours shall go up to Mount Zion to rule Mount Esau and the Kingdom shall be the Lord's." (vs21) In Habakkuk we find the words of promise, "For the earth shall be filled with the knowledge of the glory of the Lord as the waters cover the seas." (2.14) 2. Matthew uses the plural "heavens" as well as the singular probably to avoid using the name of God, and reflecting Jesus' own usage. This reminds us of the Jewish practice when reading the Hebrew scriptures to avoid using the so-called tetragrammaton, i.e. the personal name of the God of Israel written in the Hebrew Bible with the four consonants YHWH. When reading, the substitute Adonai (The Lord) is used. Jesus also shows us his typically Jewish reverence for God by using passives in the Beatitudes. to avoid the name of God. 3. Repent. George F. Moore, in his major work of Judaism, describes repentance as "the Jewish doctrine of salvation." /16 He illustrates such repentance by quoting from the Presbyterian "Shorter Catechism": "repentance unto life is a saving grace, whereby a sinner, out of a true sense of his sin and apprehension of the mercy of God (in Christ), doth with grief and hatred of his sin turn from it unto God, with full purpose of, and endeavour after, new obedience." (question 87)

It must become evident that Jesus was thoroughly a Jew. The tendency for Christian exposition is to play down the Jewishness of Jesus and, whatever Jesus says or does, to ignore those aspects that are distinctively Jewish. We have little or no evidence that Jesus disregarded the food laws of his people though he did take a radical stand on a number of issues just as the OT prophets might have done. For him the Hebrew scriptures were authoritative in a penetrating way where murder becomes hate and adultery lust. Above all, he centred the whole of the law on the two great commandments: "You shall love the Lord your God with

all your heart, and with all your soul, and with all your mind.' This is the great and first commandment. And a second is like it, "You shall love your neighbour as yourself." On these two commandments depend all the law and the prophets." (Matt 22.37-40; 7.12 and par.) In so doing, however, Jesus was just reflecting the best thought of his day. "In the Pharisee liturgy, the passage cited by Jesus, 'Hear, O Israel the Lord our God is one lord. And thou shalt love....' (Deut.6.4-5) was made the centre of the whole liturgy" /17 The Rabbi Akiba singled out love for one's neighbour as "the greatest principle in the law" (Sifre 89b). Jesus, like other Pharisee teachers of the period, was not announcing an independent moral principle, but commenting on the basic teaching of the Hebrew scriptures. /18

We have thus far pointed out the Jewishness of Jesus and have shown as far as our limited time permits something of his indebtedness to his own Jewish traditions. Like the prophets he proclaimed the near coming of the kingdom of God. Unlike the Rabbis whose students selected their teacher, Jesus called his disciples. Unlike the Rabbis also, he chose them to share in his mission. The choice of twelve disciples may or may not be significant of Jesus' intention to found a new Israel. At any rate, the Matthaean Jesus on Peter's confession of him as "the Christ, the Son of the living God", declares that on the rock of such a confession of faith he will build his church. (Mt 16.18) The question may, then, be asked since our concern is with the growth of Christianity, "how successful was the mission of Jesus?" Did he do any better than the prophets in his proclamation of the need for repentance? It would appear that in the end the results were disappointing. It is not unlikely that the Pharisees in particular came to grasp the meaning of what Jesus was really saying and doing, and understood it as a threat to their authority and dominance. If it is true that the ordinary people, the so-called "people of the land" had their sympathies primarily with the Pharisees, then the crowds that gathered round Jesus in Galilee would presumably be in their number. /19 At first flocking round Jesus, they appear in the main to have faded away. In the early source, Q, of the gospels, we find Jesus saying,

"Alas for you, Chorazin! Alas for you, Bethsaida! for if the mighty acts done in you had been done in Tyre and Sidon, they would have repented long ago sitting in dust and ashes. And you, Capernaum, will you be exalted to heaven? You shall be brought down to Hades." (Lk 10.13,15 and par.) The three towns mentioned here, Chorazin, Bethsaida and Capernaum form a triangle at the North-West corner of lake Galilee. Here Jesus' ministry was concentrated. Far from being a success, running through Luke's gospel and on occasions in Acts, there is a note of pathos especially in relation to the Jewish people at the repudiation of Jesus' ministry. It is anticipated in the nativity account where Lk notes there was no room for Jesus in the inn.(Lk 2.7) It is underlined in the unique story of Jesus' visit to the synagogue in his own home town of Nazareth where he narrowly escaped being killed. Nor must we forget the courageous and compassionate approach to a Samaritan village where again Jesus was turned away. Indeed Jesus' lament suggests frequent unsuccessful visits to Jerusalem: "O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, killing the prophets and stoning those who are sent to you! How often would I have gathered your children together as a hen gathers her brood, and you would not!" (Mt 23.37 and par.). It is poignantly significant that after the resurrection and at Pentecost, the church numbered only 120 persons.

When we come to the book of the Acts of the Apostles so-called (it is rather "The Acts of the Holy Spirit"?), the picture is, in contrast, one of remarkable growth. As Jesus began his ministry in the Nazareth synagogue by a reference to the anointing of the Holy Spirit, so Luke again stresses the centrality of the Holy Spirit at the inauguration of the Church. While, however, Jesus is rejected, here the Holy Spirit's descent gives the disciples power, boldness and utterance, bringing about response from the thousands of Jews, including God-fearers and proselytes though not without problems and conflicts especially with the Jewish authorities. Stephen, one of the so-called "deacons", a Greek-speaking Diaspora Jew, aggravated the authorities by what appeared to be an attack on the Temple. He was accused

of blasphemy and stoned to death (the circumstances of his death recall that of Jesus).

It is important to realize that this whole struggle is a struggle within Judaism at this stage, the notable difference being that the church insists on proclaiming Jesus as the Christ. The outstanding convert - a fact underlined by three accounts of his conversion in Acts (chs 9,22,26) - was one who remained a practising Jew, we believe all his life, i.e., Paul (Saul), a Pharisee born of Pharisees, educated Acts tells us at the feet of the great Gamaliel 1, a diaspora Jew from Tarsus and previously among the fiercest persecutors of the church. The ongoing mission of the church was helped by the presence of synagogues in so many of the towns they entered. As Jews, the apostles could generally enter without much trouble and it gave them the opportunity to preach Jesus as the Christ, not always, however with acceptance. Even so, there is no doubt that without a ready platform in the synagogues, the mission would have been greatly hindered. At this period, the Jerusalem apostles attended Jewish services whether in the Temple or synagogue. In addition they shared in worship and the breaking of bread in houses opened to them.

As a result of the persecution that followed the death of Stephen, the Greek-speaking or diaspora Jews were compelled to leave Jerusalem. These included Philip, one of the seven administrators of the poor fund. This administrator proved to be an effective evangelist to the Samaritans, the half-Jews who were generally despised, even hated, by the stricter type of Jew because their forbears had intermarried with non-Jews. The Samaritan mission was markedly successful. A major problem, however, arose about the mission to non-Jews. Were they to be admitted without insisting on circumcision and adherence to the food laws? A provisional decision was made by the Council which met at Jerusalem to allow Gentiles into the community on condition that they kept themselves from immorality, from eating meat offered to idols, from things strangled or from blood. It is probable that at least one reason why they were allowed to remain at Jerusalem and were not subject to persecution was that they remained practising

Jews and kept the hours of prayer in the Temple.

Over the period from 45 to 300 AD conversions to Christianity were widespread throughout the Mediterranean world but especially among the Jews. The towns where such conversions were extensive contained large Jewish populations. They are set out for us by Martin Gilbert: /20 They include 1. Egypt: Alexandria and Pelusium; 2. Cyrenaica (North Africa): Berenice, Barca and Cyrene; 3. Greece: Corinth, Thessalonica, Sparta; 4. Islands: Cyprus, Rhodes and a large part of Crete; 5. Syria (Roman Province): Jerusalem, Caesarea, Tyre and Sidon, Damascus and Antioch; 6. Western Asia Minor: Ephesus, Pergamum, Philadelphia etc (cf. Revelation chs 2,3); 7. Areas of Paul's missionary activity: Tarsus, Perga, Iconium and Ancyra.

Up to this point we have sought to emphasize the Jewish roots of the church whether in Jesus or in the inauguration of the church at Pentecost and the subsequent growth. We have noted the points of conflict, Jesus in his relations with the Jewish authorities, his death, the martyrdom of Stephen and the subsequent persecution spear-headed by Paul.

In 64AD, the first Roman persecution of the Christians took place under Nero, probably as a result of the accusations of Jews in Rome. The Christians were accused by the so-called "public rumour" of having set fire to the city. Tradition has it, as we know, that Peter and Paul died in this persecution. From 66AD, after the Roman forces of Vespasian laid siege to Jerusalem, Judeo-Christians left Jerusalem to seek refuge at Pella. /21 In 70AD Jerusalem fell. The Temple was destroyed and the leaders of Palestinian Judaism took refuge with Jochanan ben Zakkai at Jamnia (Javneh). This event marked the first break between Jews and Christians. Jews regarded the Judeo-Christians as traitors. The situation was complicated for the Christians by the fact that Palestinian Judaism was engaged in a violent engagement with the Roman power, a conflict with which Judeo-Christians refused to identify. The result was that the links were cut with Palestinian Judaism. It is notable that the meeting of Jewish leaders at Jamnia - the same

meeting which apparently gave authoritative decision on the books of the Hebrew scriptures viz., Torah, Prophets and Writings - appears to have accepted the break with Judeo-Christians when it forbade the Jew of the Greek diaspora to read the bible in the Septuagint (Greek) version, that largely used by Christians. Further, the attitude of the Pharisaic schools may be reflected in the addition to the prayers of the synagogue, known as the Birkath-ha-Minim. It was intended to prevent Judeo-Christians coming to the synagogue and runs as follows: (though the actual text is debated): "for the excommunicate let there be no hope and the arrogant government do thou swiftly uproot in our days; and may the Christians and the heretics suddenly be laid low and not be inscribed with the righteous. Blessed art thou, O Lord, who humblest the arrogant." /22 Dr G.D. Kilpatrick brings in other evidence alongside the Birkath-ha-Minim to argue "that the Rabbinic leaders in our period were taking active measures against Jewish Christianity. These consisted in exclusion from the synagogue, from religious, and perhaps, all intercourse, in prohibition of Christian literature, and in propaganda against Jesus and the church's claim on his behalf." /23 Support for this is also taken from some writings in the NT, all written in the second half of the first century e.g., the strongest enmity is found in the book of Revelation, in John's Gospel and that of Matthew. /24

Another vital question for our study has to be: how did the church reach the judgment that Jesus was God? There is no doubt that the subject of "Jesus, the Jew". has continued to fascinate the writers and readers of modern Judaism, yet the one crucial point on which there is a clear parting of the ways is the eventual claim that Jesus was God. There are fairly obvious reasons for this: 1. Judaism prided itself on its monotheism, expressed daily in the recited Shema, "Hear, O Israel, the Lord is God, the Lord is One." (Deut 6.4) 2. Jesus was a crucified criminal. Further, in the law, he was adjudged cursed for it stands written, "Cursed is everyone who hangs upon a tree." (Deut.27.26). 3. The Jewish authorities were further enraged by the claim that Jesus rose from the dead seen as a corollary to, or confirmation of, his divinity. 4 The Hebrew scriptures

foretold a coming Messiah but not one who would be divine. 5. Finally, (cf 1) it was an affront of the most sacrilegious and blasphemous kind against the wholly other, the one and only holy God.

How, then, did Jewish monotheists come to believe that Jesus was God? Did they have it from the beginning or was it something that, under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, they gradually came to understand? In the early credal formulae we have to admit to a primitive view which suggested that Jesus became something at the resurrection that he was not before, e.g., Romans 1.3:

"who was descended from David according to the flesh and installed Son of God in power according to the Spirit of holiness by the resurrection from the dead." /25

Something of the same takes place in the Pentecostal speech of Peter: "Let all the house of Israel therefore know assuredly that God has made him both Lord and Christ, this Jesus whom you crucified." (Acts 2.36) /26

The pre-Pauline formula of Romans 1.3 is comparable to another in the letter to the Philippians at 2.5-11:

"Have this mind among yourselves which you have in Christ Jesus who, though he was in the form of God, did not count equality with God a thing to be grasped, but emptied himself, taking the form of a servant, being born in the likeness of men. And being found in human form he humbled himself and became obedient unto death, even death on a Cross. Therefore God has highly exalted him and bestowed on him the name which is above every name, that, at the name of Jesus, every knee should bow and every tongue confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father."

It is notable that there is no mention of the resurrection here though it may be implicit. We may note the suggestion of reward: "Therefore..." "highly exalted", "Bestowed on Him", even the suggestion that Jesus became something that he was not previously. Note, however, also, that whatever is given Jesus it is to the glory of God, the Father. /27

It becomes clear that the church has had to grapple in various ways with the complex mystery of the person of Christ. One way was to explain away the humanity of Christ, a docetism traces of which are especially clear in the Fourth Gospel and in 1 John. A pivotal passage is often located in Mark, the confession at Caesarea-Philippi. Peter declares "You are the Christ", a confession with an imperfect understanding but not to be minimized for all that. (8.29). There is of course no implication of divinity in it, however the church might later understand it. In Matthew, the confessional form is longer and more liturgical, not to say more christological. (16.16) In the synoptic Gospels there is no evidence that Jesus made any claim to be divine, a restraint that is all the more remarkable in the light of the developed faith of the Church. It is in the Fourth Gospel, however, that we get the clearest statement that Jesus is divine: "In the beginning was the Logos (Word) and the Logos was with God, and the Logos was with God." (Jn 1.1). It assumes pre-existence or rather coexistence, the verb ēn implying "was and continued to be God." The ego eimi, ("I am") characterizes important self-revelatory statements of Jesus in the Fourth Gospel, reminding us of the "I am" of Exodus 3.14 and Isaiah 43.10. /28 It is also in the Fourth Gospel that we get the peak of confessions in the NT where the disciple Thomas declares, "My Lord and my God." (20.28)

The battle for the conviction, "Jesus is God" was not an easy one. We can only deal here with the chief heresy that denied the true divinity of Jesus was propagated by a priest called Arius. He came forward in 319 AD and propagated a view that came to be known as Arianism. It was not until 381 that his view was finally rejected by the Council of Constantinople. His view was that the Son of God was not eternal. Rather, he was created by the Father from Nothing as an instrument for the creation of the world. Therefore he was not God by nature but a changeable creature. The division caused by this teaching in the church forced Constantinople to convene the Council of Nicaea in 325. They drew up the Nicene Creed, traditionally linked with the celebration of the church's

eucharist. It has in it an affirmation which reflects the christological conflict. The definitive phrases on Jesus are:

We believe in one Lord Jesus Christ, the only Son of God, eternally begotten of the Father, God from God, Light from light, begotten not made, one in Being with the Father.

These sentences from the Nicene Creed represent essentially the faith of the church today.

There is a tragic corollary to this assertion of Jesus as divine. It comes from a reading back into the gospel accounts of the Passion of such an understanding of Jesus as God. The absurd but, in the light of subsequent anti-semitism, deadly claim was that the "Jews" at the passion knowingly killed God. How could "Jews" at this stage discern in Jesus God? Not even the disciples at this stage had such a decisive understanding. Again, what is meant by "Jews"? Does it mean the whole of Israel whether in Jerusalem or out of it? Is it meant to include the succeeding generations of Jews? This is, sadly, how the church has understood it and understood it wrongly. The reality is that only a limited number of Jews under the influence of the Jewish authorities were associated with the events that brought about Jesus' death. And even if they were associated with the death, surely the death of anyone unjustly punished is a commonplace of human history and cruelty.

Did the church not know of Jesus' prayer on the Cross, "Father, forgive them for they know not what they do?" Why is this saying from the Cross only found in Luke whether his gospel or in parallel statements in the book of Acts? Did Matthew or Mark not know of it or if they did, did they deliberately leave it out, yielding to some pressure group in the church? Certainly Peter in the Lucan Acts, assured the Jews that neither authorities nor those incited by them knew what they were doing (Acts 3.17). Yet this serious indictment that the "Jews" killed God, were guilty of deicide, was allowed by the church and opened the door to serious misrepresentation of the Jewish position. The church must confess its guilt.

But there is another question we must ask. Why do we make so much of the Gospels or the writings of Paul or the apostles? What, in fact, were the authorities for the teaching of the church? Here again we recall the Church's debt to Judaism. From the very first, the Hebrew scriptures were the arbiter of what was authoritative. From the very first, a phrase, "as it stands written", or similar words, were a preface to a quotation from scripture. All the NT writers were, of course, with the exception of Luke, Jews, and to them the Torah, the prophets and the writings were authoritative. Jesus, too, studied the scriptures, and found his own vocation there. What was the Christian method of interpretation of the Hebrew scriptures? It was not dissimilar to that of members of the Qumran community. The latter centred their interpretation on their leader, the Teacher of Righteousness, and used him as a key to unlock the meaning of the scripture. In much the same way, the church made Jesus the key to the understanding of what the Hebrew scriptures said. Matthew, for example, pinpoints major events in the life of Jesus with the formula, "in order that it might be fulfilled." Whatever it was, whether it related to his birth, the centre of his ministry in Capernaum, his healing ministry, his vocation as Suffering Servant, all of it was in fulfilment of the divine purpose. Thus what was used to interpret scripture was the christological key. Here the church's dependence on the Hebrew scriptures is patent.

We can accept, then, the authority of the Hebrew scriptures from the very beginnings of the church. But what about the church's writings? Though Jesus gave us nothing in writing, from the beginning his sayings were authoritative for the church. The gospel writers emphasize that Jesus taught with authoritative power. There is a magisterial authority, for example, about the phrase, "You have heard that it was said to the men of old, BUT I say unto you." Even when there is a story about Jesus, it is often clinched and driven home by a saying of Jesus. Indeed, the only reason for the story could be to highlight a saying of Jesus. By the middle of the second century the gospels were being read in the services of worship alongside the Hebrew scriptures. The letters of Paul, or

the so-called "Pauline Corpus", were collected by the end of the second century and were read also in the services of worship. Anything that derived from apostolic sources became authoritative but a writing could also merely have inherent or intrinsic authority such as, for example, the Epistle to the Hebrews. It was only at the end of the fourth century that, at least in the Western church, our present twenty-seven books of the NT were accepted as the rule of faith for the church. In the second century, a Christian, Marcion, attempted to reject the Hebrew scriptures but such a view was rejected as heretical. A part of the church did not accept all twenty-seven books and indeed the Eastern church was content for a time with twenty-two.

These writings, the Hebrew scriptures and the NT, came to be recognized as having supreme authority for the church, even to the point of verbal inspiration for some. This meant that everything in the written deposit took on an absolute authority as given under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit. Again, we are confronted with the influence of Judaism on the church. The NT acquires the same authority as was given to the earlier thirty-nine books.

In 312 AD an event took place which was of great significance for the church, Constantine who had just defeated his rival, Maxentius, at the Milvian Bridge, became ruler of the Roman Empire. At this battle Constantine adopted as his standard the Greek letters Chi and Rho, representing the first two letters of the name "Christ". In 313 he promulgated the edict of Milan whereby Christianity attained the status of toleration. It now became the religion most favourably regarded by the State. Previously Jews who became Christian had been punished by fellow-Jews. This was forbidden. Christians no longer had to offer pagan sacrifices. The clergy were exempt from some taxes. Sunday became compulsorily a day of rest. In the Canons of Elvira enacted in 339 by Constantius III (337-361) Jews were to be separated from Christians. Inter-marriage between Jews and Christians was not allowed. Jews were forbidden to have slaves whether Christian or pagan. But it was especially at the accession of Theodosius II in 383 and continuing until the

death of his son, Arcadius, in 408 that the Jews came under attack. The patriarchate of the Jews of the land of Israel, the ethnarch and his administration, were done away with. Edicts were passed that reduced the Jews to second-class citizens. Between the years 404 to 438 Jews could no longer hold office in the civil service or become representatives of cities, serve in the army or at the bar.

But it was not only the State that attacked the Jews. The hostility came from the church. Dr James Parkes, /29 in his book on "Antisemitism", sets out for us what some of the Fathers of the fourth century said about Judaism. Some of their statements are quite outrageous and patently false. We can set out some examples. Hilary, Bishop of Poitiers, in western France, comments on Psalm 52 where the tyrant boasts of his wickedness and the Psalmist asks: "Why do you boast, O mighty man, of mischief done against the ungodly? All the day long you are plotting destruction." (vi) Hilary applied it to the Jewish people who, he declared "had always persisted in iniquity and out of its abundance of evil, gloried in wickedness." John Chrysostom, Archbishop of Constantinople, in 387 found that the Christians were being too friendly with their Jewish neighbours, launched a vicious and unbalanced onslaught on the Jews. He told the Christians that their Jewish neighbours "sacrifice their sons and daughters to devils; outrage nature; overthrow from their foundations the laws of relationship; are become worse than wild beasts; and, for no reason at all, murder their own offspring to worship the avenging devils who are attempting to destroy Christianity." Later, Chrysostom had to qualify these extreme statements which were clearly untrue. It is incredible to think that such outbursts were often based on scripture.

But, tragically, the support of the Fathers and the Church has run its course over centuries of distortion and persecution. Martin Gilbert sets out, in graphic form, the incredible history of anti-semitism of which we can only give fragments. Up until 300 AD, Jews lived in every part of the Roman Empire; they had freedom to practise their religion and to practise Jewish law in disputes among the Jews (14,15). The radical change in the position of the Jews under Christian rule has already been given above. /30

The latter sets the scene for centuries to come. In 1320 the notorious yellow badge was forced upon Jews in Cyprus. (p25); at Rhodes in 1502, Jews were forcibly converted, expelled or driven into slavery; ghettos were established in Constantinople, in Rhodes, and in Greece at Patras and Modon in areas of large population; in France, from 800-1500, the situation is varied: from 1200 to 1500, the area around Marseilles saw flourishing Jewish literary and scientific activity; in an area stretching from Troyes to Rouen, expulsions of Jews took place with the final expulsion taking place in 1394; places of anti-Jewish violence include Bray(1191), Rameru(1171), Blois (1191) and Chinon (1321) (p26); while Jews in Germany seemed to live in peace until 1000 AD, in the period 1000-1500, in no less than twenty-six towns, Jews were persecuted, and fled, some to Poland (1096, 1100-1400) or to the Ottoman empire (1348, 1360). The list is endless but note especially that in Budapest in 1279, the Church Council decreed that all Jews must wear a ring of red cloth on the left hand side of their outer garments.(p29). The flight of the Jews from Germany to Poland continued throughout the 12th, 13th and 14th centuries. Even in Poland, the charge of deicide with all the accretions arising from superstitious and illiterate people was bound to take effect and the first outbreak in 1399 was frightening. In the town of Posen, a Rabbi and thirteen elders were accused of theft and desecration of church property. They were first tortured, and then burnt alive. These are only examples of what happened, it would seem, in all other European nations [cf Italy (37), England (38), Spain and Portugal (41) and Russia (41)]

But the fourth century set the scene for the anti-semitism of Martin Luther also. In a pamphlet, entitled "Martin Luther and the Jews /31, there is included a Tract of Luther, "On the Jews and their Lies". Astonishing, wild things are written. Luther is prepared to accept unverified slanders against the Jews that they are guilty of ritual murder, that they poison wells, that they drink human blood (He does recognize that the Jews do deny such.) But especially uninhibited are the following sentences: (16f)

What shall we do with this rejected, condemned Jewish people? We dare not be partakers of their lies, their cursing, their blasphemy. We cannot quench the fire of God's wrath, or convert them..... First, their synagogues and schools must be destroyed, burned or buried, as a sign that we Christians will not put up with open blasphemy against God and His Christ. Then, since the Jews teach the same blasphemies in their homes, we must destroy their houses and put them into barns and sheds like gypsies. Third, their prayer books and Talmuds where these blasphemies are written are to be taken away. Fourth, the Rabbis who teach such things must be banished.

The Lutheran World Federation in 1964 repudiated this kind of anti-Semitism. It declared:

"Anti-Semitism is primarily a denial of the image of God in the Jew; it represents a demonic form of rebellion against the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob; and a rejection of Jesus the Jew, directed upon his people. 'Christian' Anti-Semitism is spiritual suicide....in light of the long terrible history of Christian culpability for anti-Semitismas Lutherans, we confess our peculiar guilt, and we lament with shame the responsibility which our Church and her people bear for this sin." /32

Similarly, the Second Vatican Council rejected the anti-semitic statements of the Fathers. It states:

"Although the Church is the new people of God, the Jews should not be presented as rejected by God or accursed, as if this followed from the Holy Scriptures. All should see to it then that in catechetical work or in preaching of the Word of God that they do not teach anything that does not conform to the truth of the Gospel or the spirit of Christ."

The Holocaust was an appalling and perhaps inevitable climax to the history of a Church given over to persecution of the Jewish people. It has thoroughly shaken the Church out of its complacency. Today the present task for both Jew and Christian is to seek to understand one another, and to value each other's traditions and cultures.

There is, however, one thing that perhaps should be stressed. We must, in all honesty, take account of areas of difference. We cannot ignore them or diminish them. Goodwill does not entail the watering down of either Judaism or Christianity. As Rabbi Raymond Apple expressed it /33 "Though coming from a common origin, each of the two religions has distinctive concepts which have no place in the

thinking of the other, and indeed, as Travers Herford stated categorically, 'Judaism and Christianity can never blend without the surrender by the one or the other of its fundamental principles.'"

Notes

1. The lecture was delivered on the 22nd February in Dublin, and has been published by permission,
2. The paper has been expanded from that originally delivered especially in the later stages.
3. Roth, Cecil, The Jewish Contribution to Civilisation, Oxford, 1943, 2,3
4. C.G. Montefiore, The Synoptic Gospels, 2 vols., (London, 1927); also Rabbinic Literature and Gospel Teaching (London, 1930)
5. Klausner, J., Jesus of Nazareth (trans from Hebrew), (NYork and London, 1925)
6. Vermes, G, Jesus the Jew, (London 1973); also Scripture and Tradition in Judaism, (Leiden 1961); David Flusser, Jesus, trans. Ronald Walls, (NYork, 1969); Sandmel, Samuel, The first Christian Century in Judaism and Christianity (Oxford 1969); also A Jewish Understanding of the New Testament, (London 1977)
7. The latin form is Iesus
8. The Gospel of Luke, (London, 1930 Moffatt), 20f
9. The origin of the synagogue still remains obscure however. cf TDNT, Vol VII, 810
10. Flusser, op.cit., claims that healing on the Sabbath was always permitted, even when the illness was not serious; in any case Jesus performs the healing with words, as was permitted. (49,50); cf also Maccoby, Hyam M., Judaism in the First Century, (London 1989), 45.
11. The implication here is of cursing as the contrary condition; cf Deut.11.26: "Behold, I set before you

this day a blessing and a curse." Cf Lk 6.20-26; Mt 23

12. Although there are two forms of the prayer, that in Matthew and that in Luke(11.1-4), church tradition chose the former and developed it in liturgical fashion as the textual evidence indicates.
13. So W.D. Davies, Dale C. Allison, Jr, The Gospel According to Saint Matthew, Vol I [T&T Clark, Edinburgh, ICC 1988), 599f
14. op.cit. 100
15. Cf Davies, Allison,op.cit. 595
16. G.F. Moore, Judaism, Vol I, 500
17. Maccoby, op.cit. 119f
18. ibid.
19. Maccoby,op.cit.12:"The Pharisees were...a three-tiered movement consisting of sages, rank-and-file Pharisees, and 'people of the land.'"
20. Martin Gilbert, Jewish History Atlas,(Weidenfeld & Nicholson, London 1969), 18
21. But cf E.P. Sanders, Jewish and Christian Self-Definition, Vol I for the essay by Gerd Lüdemann, "The Successors of Pre-70 Jerusalem Christianity: A Critical Evaluation of the Pella Tradition," (SCM, London 1980), 161-173 where he calls into question the historicity of the Pella tradition.
22. The translation is that of G.D. Kilpatrick,The Origins of the Gospel According to St. Matthew, (Oxford 1946), 109.
23. op.cit. 113
24. It is especially the Gospels of St. John and St Matthew that have given rise to anti-semitism.
25. For the most recent discussion on the meaning of the verb ἰσχυρίζομαι see Ernst Käsemann, An die Römer, HNT, [J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck)Tübingen 1974; also C.B. Cranfield, Romans, Vol 1 (ICC, T&T Clark 1975) ad loc.

26. Hans Conzelmann, (Acts of the Apostles, ET, Hermeneia series, Fortress Press, 1987), on ch.2.36 denies that there is an adoptionist ring here. Rather the formulation is Lucan. "Luke derives the combination of the two titles from the scriptural proof, the results of which he summarizes here; he obtains the Messiah title (v31) from Psalm 16 and the kurios title from Psalm 110."
27. For an important discussion on kurios, see Werner Kramer, Christ, Lord, Son of God, in Studies in Biblical Theology (SCM, London ET 1966), 15a-19a
28. Cf Friedrich Büchsel on John 8.58 (TDNT, Vol II, 399)
29. James Parkes, Antisemitism, (London, Vallentine Mitchell, 1963), 64
30. Martin Gilbert, op.cit.19 points out that under Muslim rule Jews found greater toleration than under Christianity
31. E. Gordon Rupp, Martin Luther and the Jews, Robert Whalley Cohn Memorial Lecture (The Council of Christians and Jews, 1972), 16,17
32. Stepping Stone to Further Jewish-Christian Relations (An unabridged collection of Christian Documents); Compiled by Helga Croner, (Stimulus Books, London, New York, 1977), 86
33. E. Gordon Rupp, Martin Luther and the Jews, (The Council of Christians and Jews, London 1972), 16f

Alice L. Laffey, *An Introduction to the Old Testament:
A Feminist Perspective.*
Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1988.
pp. xii, 243.

I accepted the commission to review this book with some interest. Although I have never clearly understood exactly what is meant by 'feminism' and have always been somewhat suspicious about any factional approach to biblical studies, I accept that, somewhere between the idiocy of referring to women by the conventional abbreviation for 'manuscript' and the lunacy of coining words like 'personufacture', there exists a serious sociological issue relating to human emancipation, the viewpoints of which may well have something of value to contribute to the study of the bible. From this volume I hoped to learn something of this phenomenon, but I was disappointed.

My first act, on receiving the volume, was to look at the index of biblical references to see whether it is arranged according to the Jewish or Christian canon (a very minor matter, but one which interests me in that it may indicate something of the author's preconceptions, particularly in these days when the very term 'Old Testament' is being dropped from academic use, because of its sectarian implication, in favour of 'Hebrew Bible' or 'Jewish Scriptures'). To my surprise, I found that neither arrangement applies, nor yet a third, which is occasionally encountered, where the biblical books are listed in alphabetical order. The index of this book lists the books of the Pentateuch and Former Prophets (though without using these, or any other, sub-headings) in the standard order of the Jewish canon, but those of the Latter Prophets and Writings are arranged according to some notion of the chronological order of their composition. It took a few minutes to figure this out, and it seems to be the best explanation for a curious state of affairs, but the inconsistency does not end there, for appended to the same single list are two books of Apocrypha - Wisdom of Solomon and Wisdom of Ben Sirach (*sic*) - and the four Gospels, each group arranged according to canonical, not chronological, order.

To find an index arranged in such an idiosyncratic manner that it is virtually useless is not the most encouraging introduction to any book but, undeterred, I turned back to the text, dipped in at various places, and then started to read it in order, from the beginning.

The book is arranged in four parts, the Pentateuch, the Deuteronomistic History, the Major and Minor Prophets, and the Writings, with each part following a standard format. An Introduction

(barely a page for the Pentateuch, three pages for the Deuteronomistic History, six each for the Prophets and Writings) dealing with Historical and Literary Considerations, is followed by a section on Themes from a Feminist Perspective (with the same set of sub-headings - Patriarchy and Hierarchy; Israel's History as Men's History; Language: Masculine by Preference and a Male God; Women as Men's Possessions; Role Stereotyping and Sexual Discrimination; Exceptions within a Patriarchal Culture - employed, with some slight variations, in each part), a section which examines selected Texts from a Feminist Perspective, and a Conclusion with Recommended Readings. A fifth part offers, in just over two pages, a conclusion on the Tasks of Feminist Interpretation and some further Recommended Readings.

It will be clear from this brief description that the book is mis-titled. For two hundred years the words 'Introduction to the Old Testament' have been used to designate descriptions of the origin and development of the literature in the Old Testament, matters which this book treats in the most cursory fashion (one page for the Pentateuch!), and then often in sentences which begin with 'scholars think ...', or similar words, without any indication that other scholars think otherwise. All this book has to contribute to the complex question of the origin of biblical literature is that it is the product of a 'patriarchal' (the word is used in the special feminist, not the normal biblical, sense) culture, which is hardly a startlingly novel discovery. I do not say that the book should not have been written (though what it has to say could have been said with greater economy and less monotony), but it ought to have had a different title.

It ought also to have been written differently. For one thing, it is not always clear whether it is against the 'patriarchy' of the biblical authors or that of some unidentified interpreter that the writer is railing. At times, when it is clearly the latter that is the case, Laffey goes overboard in her efforts to redress the wrongs committed against womanhood by previous (male) interpreters. For example, in her discussion of the case of Bathsheba, whom she takes pains to vindicate as an innocent and unsuspecting victim of a king intent on rape, she makes the following, incredible, statement:

'The text in no way suggests that her bathing was immodest. David was on the roof of his palace (the highest roof in Jerusalem?) looking down. From there he could see the whole city, and everyone in it.' (p. 120)

But the text does not say that David could see through walls or shuttered windows. How, then, could he see everyone in the city, let alone a woman in her bath who did not wish to be seen?

But there are even stranger episodes in the book. This one, for example, from a discussion on how the linguistic principle of 'masculine by preference' may mislead bible-readers into thinking that personal names refer to men when, in fact, they may just as well refer to women:

'For example, the reader is familiar with the character Noah, who takes his family and the animals into the ark during the flood (Gen 6:9-9:17). But, one might ask, is the reader aware that "Noah" is also a woman's name? Noah is the daughter of Zelophehad (Num 26:33; 27:1; 36:11). The reader may be less familiar with the name "Puah", but the name clearly identifies a midwife in Exod 1. The name "Puah" also occurs elsewhere (Gen 46:13; Judg 10:1; 1 Chr 7:1), in each case referring to a male descendant of Issachar.' (p. 15)

So far as it goes, this is sound, but it relates only to English bibles, which, as Dr Laffey really ought to have pointed out, use the same Roman alphabet form for quite different Hebrew names: Noah of the flood story is נֹחַ, while Noah, daughter of Zelophehad, is נֹחָה. Puah, the midwife, is פּוּעָה, while the others are פֹּנָה (Gen), and פּוֹאָה (Judg and Chr), probably variant spellings of the same name but distinct from that of the midwife.

But the most egregious error (if it is appropriate to describe as error such an outrageous misrepresentation of a simple fact) of all must be this one, from a discussion of Genesis 2-3:

'God curses the serpent for what "she" (serpent is feminine in Hebrew) has done: she will crawl on her belly and she will always be regarded by humans as their enemy.' (p. 23f.)

The Hebrew for "serpent" (נָחָשׁ) is masculine, in Gen 3 as elsewhere, and God speaks to the serpent in that chapter using masculine forms. How anyone could think otherwise is beyond comprehension, but there may here be an important clue to understanding this book and its author.

In the Preface, Dr Laffey explains that her 'purpose is not to add to the body of information which students must master. Rather, it is my hope that *those who read this book will themselves develop a feminist critical consciousness*' (her italics). Earlier she describes the awakening of her own feminist consciousness in her experience as a doctoral student in the Pontifical Biblical Institute in Rome, where she felt she was treated as a second-class citizen because of her sex. If she really was treated as a second-class citizen at the Biblicum, might it not, rather, have been because she was a second-rate student?

John Barclay, Obeying the Truth, A Study of Paul's Ethics in Galatians

T. & T. Clark, 1988 pp.xv, 298 £16.95

It is an indication of the complexity and fascination of Paul's letter to the Galatians that so many scholars have continued to write about it in recent years. Here we have yet another contribution from a promising young N.T. scholar, Dr John Barclay. It derives from a doctoral thesis accepted by the University of Cambridge in 1986 and supervised by Professor Morna Hooker.

Dr Barclay speaks unusually of "Ethics" in Galatians. He gives two reasons for the neglect of ethics in the past (1) the uncertainty among scholars on the way in which to interpret the paraenetic material in 5.13-6.10. (2) The Lutheran and reformed attack on "works of the law" as a human work and achievement. This tends to relegate the ethical instructions to a mere addendum. To confer on these any greater importance would lead to a confession that Paul is concerned to encourage works after all (6,7).

We have a very lucid survey of views on the paraenetic material in 5.13-6.10 covering some twenty-seven pages (9-35). Is it an interpolation into the letter (O'Neill)? Or unrelated to the rest of the letter (Dibelius)? Is 5.13-26 an apologetic appendix to guard against any misunderstanding of the first part of the letter (Burton) or does it guard against libertine tendencies with some of the members of the Galatian community? (Lütgert, Ropes). Other views that suggest the section be integrated into the letter include an attack on Gnostic opponents throughout (Schmithals) or an attempt to clarify some moral confusion among the members (Jewett, Betz); or it becomes an ironical polemic against the law: "it is precisely the Galatians' attempt to avoid the flesh by observing the law which enmeshes them fully in the flesh." (22) H.D. Betz' analysis of the letter as an apologetic

type after Greek and Latin models supports the integrated structure of the letter(25)

In a section on "The Nature of our Evidence", Barclay mentions the problems of "mirror-reading" as a procedure for gaining evidence "an extremely difficult task, as prone to misinterpretation as the incidental overhearing of one end of a telephone conversation." (Hooker, 17,N.1) Barclay considers that Paul himself in a heavily polemical attack on the agitators, "delivers a very partial and biased account of events" (37); it "has to be taken with a pinch of salt"(46). These are remarkable words and it does not appear clear to this reviewer that the basis for such a conjectural statement is present.

The same chapter (2) deals with "The Demand for Circumcision" as a secure base from which to analyze the Galatian crisis (46). He discusses the various explanations for requesting circumcision by the opponents viz gnostic rite (Schmithals), "a powerful mystery initiation (Brinsmead), to gain perfection (Jewett), bodily circumcision as the natural counterpart of Paul's preaching of ethical circumcision (Borgen) or social pressures (Lütgert) - all of which Dr Barclay discards as unsatisfactory (52). Dr Barclay argues that the opponents made use of Abraham, "the father of proselytes, who, by accepting circumcision, became his true descendants" (54); that social factors played their part: the Gentile Christians had abandoned their worship of pagan deities; it would involve a serious disruption in one's relationships(family, friends, fellow club members, business associates and civic authorities) (58); in such a situation of disorientation without Paul to advise them that they should seek a firm identity with Judaism through circumcision. (58f) The awkward verse in 6.13 ("For even those who do receive circumcision are not thoroughgoing observers of the law; they only want you to be circumcized in order to boast of you having submitted to that outward rite") is one that Dr. Barclay is "extremely hesitant to take...at face value"(65) It bears on his conclusion that the crisis had to do not only with identity but with behavioural patterns

The whole of this book is characterized by careful,

thoughtful and discerning work, affording a pattern of the way in which discussion should be conducted. It takes into account as far as I can judge all important recent writing and displays an impressive grasp of the material.

For those who regard the book of Galatians as supremely a reformation charter, that a person is saved by grace through faith, that salvation has nothing whatever to do with legalism, the "works of the law" and that Paul fights with might and main against adherence to any other Gospel, Dr. Barclay's work can be salutary reading. Consider for example the sentence which forms part of the conclusion: "Thus I would join hands with Sanders(E.P.), Watson and others, seeking to overthrow the individualistic Lutheran interpretation of Galatians which views Paul as arguing here against the attitude of self-righteousness, that is, dependence on the number or quality of one's works to earn status with God" (241) Here Dr Barclay appears to be greatly influenced by Ernest Sanders who maintains that Paul is not attempting to raise any such general theological questions as these. Dr Sanders takes the contrast between faith and works of the law as restricted to the specific issue as to how Gentiles enter the people of God (33). The understanding here is that Paul did not oppose "works" as such or even the "law" as such, but only the notion that Gentiles need to observe the whole Mosaic law... in order to enter the Christian community". The only major point on which Barclay differs from Sanders is his sharp distinction between "getting in" and "staying in", insisting that both are important.

Other points which may not meet with general agreement are the understanding of "flesh" as referring to what is merely human. It is true that the Hebrew word basar refers to man's weakness and mortality, and this sense is also found in the NT. Surely there is something more sinister involved. Wheeler Robinson suggests that the figure of an external power obtaining or usurping authority over man through the weak-

ness of the flesh can find parallels throughout Paul. "Paul's whole conception of hamartia, 'sin' is dominated by it"(The Christian Doctrine of Man, T. & T. Clark, 1943 116f). Paul himself wrote as if sin and flesh were synonymous (cf W.D. Stacey, The Pauline view of Man, 178) The "flesh" (sarx) is in fact, the sphere of the demonic (cf E. Käsemann, Pauline Perspectives, SCM (ET), 1971) Does Dr Barclay play down the seriousness of the Spirit-flesh conflict? Does he so de-individualize that we lose the impact and the cruciality of this battle?

Is the price that Dr Barclay has paid to ensure the integration of 5.13-6.10 into the total argument of Paul too high?

Union Theological College,
Belfast

E.A. Russell

Peter Pokorny, The Genesis of Christology, Foundations for a Theology of the New Testament; Edinburgh, T&T Clark 1987. pp266

One of the problems faced by anyone writing a Christology of the NT is the age-old one of finding a single, all-embracing christology within the many seemingly differing christologies found in the various books of the NT. Either one ignores the problem and contents oneself with writing about the various christologies in the various books without any attempt at synthesis, or one attempts a history of the development of christology in the first century C.E., beginning with Jesus' own self-understanding, continuing through the first strivings after a christology in the early creeds and the developed discussion in Paul and ending with the Gospel writers.

Professor Pokorny, Professor of Theology and NT at the Comenius Faculty of Protestant Theology in Prague, Czechoslovakia, in his book, The Genesis of Christology, has chosen the second approach. In so doing he is following a path well trodden by scholars such as Bultmann

(Theology of the NT, ET 1968), Jeremias, (NT Theology, Part I), Goppelt, (Theology of the NT, Vols 1 and 2) and, more recently, Schillebeeckx, (Jesus, ET 1979 and Christ, ET 1980), Kasper (Jesus the Christ 1976) and James Dunn (Christology in the Making, 1980). While not going a great deal further than the scholarship on which he builds, Professor Pokorny does all those interested in the subject the service of providing them with a good clear analysis of the present state of scholarship and, at the same time, offering them some perspicacious and well-balanced observations of his own on individual problems.

His first chapter entitled, "The Problem and the Method", deals with questions of methodology. He points out that in writing any history, whether secular or religious, the historian must represent his subject with the help of constructive theories. However "in the formation of such hypotheses the personality of the researcher always plays an important role" (p6) and the writer and reader must be aware of this. Also, in history writing, when a hypothetical model has been constructed, it cannot be tested by scientific experiment as in the physical sciences, but only by the test of consistency, by asking the question, "whether it is possible to integrate the results of individual bits of research into a consistent structure." (p7) With these limitations in mind, Professor Pokorny begins his investigation of the development of christology in the first century C.E.

The rest of the book is concerned, firstly, with the teaching of the historical Jesus and his view of his mission, and, secondly, with the church's proclamation of Jesus. In the first section, in the chapter entitled "Jesus of Nazareth", we are given a careful and well-balanced analysis of the role of the historical Jesus in the development of christology. Starting from the assumption that "without the earthly Jesus, christology would remain an idle speculation," stress is laid on the importance of the Easter message for our understanding of Jesus and the development of christology in the early church.

This chapter has three main sections: Jesus' teaching on the kingdom, his ethics and his self-consciousness.

Reviews, IBS 11, April 1989

His first two sections (on the Kingdom and Ethics) are excellent summaries of the present state of scholarship but do not contribute a great deal to what has been already said in the older books of Jeremias and Goppelt. The third section (on Jesus' self-consciousness) is a careful, critical analysis of Bultmann's assertion that Jesus did not think of himself as the Messiah. Dr Pokorny argues that while Jesus did not identify with any pre-formed idea of the Messiah, he "may have grappled with the sufferings he envisaged in terms of the notion of the suffering, rescued (Ps.22) and glorified one (Wisdom 2.12-20;5.1-7)." (p54) He goes on to argue that the titles, Messiah, Lord, Son of God, and Son of Man used in its apocalyptic sense were not found on the lips of the historical Jesus.

In the second section, he is concerned with the church's mission to proclaim Jesus as Lord. Professor Pokorny argues that the decisive impulse to that mission was the Easter event. This section is particularly detailed and is valuable not only for its general argument, but also its treatment of such thorny problems as the Empty Tomb.

The book is not easy to read. It is certainly not an introduction to NT christology. but rather assumes a knowledge of NT scholarship which many readers would not have. Moreover, in spite of the skill of the translator, there are times when one is very aware that it is a translation and when one longs to be able to have recourse to the original for clarification. However, for those prepared to make the effort, the book provides a very useful discussion of some of the most difficult and demanding problems of NT scholarship. Any time and effort spent on perusing it will be well rewarded.

Union Theological College,
Belfast

J.C. McCullough

John Barton, People of the Book? (sub-title: The Authority of the Bible in Christianity)

SPCK, London £4.95 90pp

The author is lecturer in OT and fellow and chaplain at St. Cross College, Oxford. This book, which is the Bampton lecture of 1988, seeks to present an attitude to the bible which avoids the errors of fundamentalism while upholding the authority of the Bible. "Popular fundamentalism knows of only two attitudes to scripture: its own belief that the bible is inerrant in everything that it affirms, and the sole source of all Christian truth, and what it calls 'liberalism.'" Barton is concerned about this attitude and the increase of fundamentalism for two reasons: "First, it forces the non-conservative Christian to spend much time and energy showing why the bible is not the infallible oracle fundamentalists suppose it to be and in the process appearing to have a much less full-blooded faith than they - And second, it deflects the average person's attention from the fact that most non-conservative, non-fundamentalist Christians do in fact honour and value the bible." Barton respects the intelligence behind conservative biblicism but has come to feel "that much of the fundamentalists' case is not simply a bad thing but a good thing gone wrong: they point us towards important truths but veer away from these themselves at the last moment because a doctrinaire conservatism blinds their eyes."

Barton argues that two approaches to the Jewish scriptures are to be found in the early church, and even within the writings of one person. Also, the Lord Jesus accepted the scriptures as "the word of his Father" but most of his teaching came by direct revelation from the Father. Paul also accepted the Jewish scriptures but foremost in his writings is the Lord; "God is speaking a new word through him both in his teaching and in his actions."

Barton believes that "the relation of the faith which Christians profess to the scripture which informs and nourishes that faith is...essentially and inherently one of tension." This is found in the nature of the gospel itself. For "the Christian gospel...is that God who already is known has, nevertheless, just done something new and unprecedented - something which means nothing less

than the remaking of the world. In relation to the OT this implies that there can be no Christianity without it and yet none that knows it alone. In relation to the NT....it meant that there could be no fresh impulses from the Holy Spirit that contradicted the revelation in Christ recorded there; and yet - precisely because the Spirit is active and makes all things new - there could never be a mere conservatism of the written letter." The author argues that "we can account adequately for the position that scripture holds in the Christian faith only on the basis of a belief that God was genuinely and uniquely known in Israel and was then made more perfectly known through Jesus Christ." He reminds us that "Christianity is not in the last resort about relations between texts but about events in the real world; the Word of God did not become incarnate in a book but in a life, The gospel is....about new life in Christ." He is the Word of God. "The bible and the word of preaching are both called the Word of God by a transfer from him, secondarily." Christians need to take seriously "the proposition that Christ, and not the bible, is the true Word of God." This proposition "needs to become truly functional for faith...if Christians are not to become 'a people of the book' in a sense inimical to the gospel of free redemption in Christ."

I hope I have written enough and quoted enough to encourage clergy and students for the ministry to read this book. It has the great blessing of brevity, backed by scholarship, each chapter having anything from half a page to two pages of footnotes. If the book has a fault it is the lack of demonstration of the author's position; but this is due to the limitations imposed by the Bampton lectures. Could these be removed if another printing is required?

Edgehill College,
Belfast

J. McCormack.